PLAINTIFFS' MOTION TO AMEND PURSUANT TO RULE 15(b)(1) - 1 CASE NO. 3:20-cv-05223-RJB

investigate and initiate disciplinary action. Mayor McDaniel was the policy maker as it pertains to the City of Roy's law enforcement policies and disciplinary actions.

III. STATEMENT OF ISSUES

The Plaintiffs' Rule 15(b)(1) Motion to Amend presents one issue as follows:

- 1. Include Mayor Rawlin "Anthony" McDaniel as a defendant for purposes of 42 U.S.C. § 1983 *Monell* claims against the City of Roy, is a policymakers for the City of Roy with respect to discipline?
- Paragraphs VIII (identification of parties), XIX XXIII (factual allegations), XXVI
 (Section 1983 action), XXIX (Negligence), XXXVII (loss of consortium) should be amended to include
 Mayor McDaniel.

IV. EVIDENCE RELIED UPON

The Plaintiffs rely upon the pleadings already on record as well as the evidence and testimony presented in Plaintiffs' Case-in-Chief.

V. <u>LEGAL AUTHORITY AND ARGUMENT</u>

A. Plaintiffs' Move to Amend their Complaint under Rule 15(b(1)

Amendments to pleadings are liberally granted. (*Forman v. Davis* 83 S. Ct. 227). Pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P. 15(b)(1), when "...a party objects that evidence is not within the issues raised in the pleadings, the court may permit the pleadings to be amended. The court should freely permit amendment when doing so will aid in presenting the merits and the objecting party fails to satisfy the court that the evidence would prejudice that party's action or defense on the merits."

Here, Defendants themselves have identified Mayor McDaniel as the proper party with respect to Plaintiffs' ratification allegations against City of Roy and Chief Armitage. Mayor McDaniel was the policy maker within the meaning of the statute.

25

26

9

1617

18 19

2021

23

///

///

///

///

24

25

26

PLAINTIFFS' MOTION TO AMEND PURSUANT TO RULE 15(b)(1) - 3 CASE NO. 3:20-cv-05223-RJB

Defendants would not be prejudiced by such an amendment where all Defendants, including Mayor McDaniel are represented by the same counsel and the same legal arguments, claims, and defenses apply to him as existing Defendant Chief Armitage.

B. Mayor Rawlin "Anthony" McDaniel Should be included in the Complaint

The City of Roy, through either Armitages or the Mayor's failure to perform any investigation whatsoever is evidence of his and the Roy PD's reckless indifference to Johnson's training and discipline such that he failed to learn and/or learned to ignore its policies, including those on the use of lethal force and shooting into a vehicle.

Plaintiffs have presented evidence that the City of Roy should be liable because 1)

Johnson's actions were ratified by an official policy maker of the City of Roy, both Armitage and McDaniel and/or 2) The City of Roy and Armitage failed to properly train Johnson on the constitutional use of lethal force, and/or 3) Johnson was acting pursuant of longstanding policies, practices or customs that allowed Roy Police Officers to ignore and disregard written policies.

It has been testified to that the Mayor, on behalf of the City of Roy has fully ratified Johnson's action through the actions of their officials. Both McDaniel and Armitage have upheld Johnson's actions by completely ignoring his obvious constitutional violations when he attempted to kill Rice and Donahue without warning. McDaniel, on behalf of the City of Roy, adopted Johnson's full version of the events and published his version in a press release. Ratification can also be evidence of municipal policies that lead to constitutional violations, such as Roy's policy, practice or procedure of allowing Johnson to escape investigation or disciple for severe violations and major crimes.

Finally, Mayor McDaniel single handily ratified Officer Johnson's conduct when he testified that Johnson could stay however long he likes.

VI. **CONCLUSION** 1 Plaintiff' Rule 15(b)(1) motion to amend to include Mayor Rawlin "Anthony" McDaniel 2 with respect to the *Monell* claim, should be granted. 3 4 **DATED** this 14th day of September, 2021. 5 6 DOLAN LAW FIRM, PC 7 8 /s/ Jeremy M. Jessup JEREM M. JESSUP, WSBA #57504 9 Dolan Law Firm, PC 10 1438 Market Street San Francisco, CA 95102 11 Telephone: 415-421-2800 Fax: 415-421-2830 12 E-mail: Jeremy.jessup@dolanlawfirm.com Attorney for Plaintiffs 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25 26

PLAINTIFFS' MOTION TO AMEND PURSUANT TO RULE 15(b)(1) - 4 CASE NO. 3:20-cv-05223-RJB

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

The undersigned declares as follows:

- 1. I am over the age of 21 and not a party to this action.
- 2. I am an employee of Dolan Law Firm, PC, Attorney for Plaintiffs.
- 3. On this day, I certify that I filed the foregoing with the Clerk of the Court using the CM/ECF system, which will send notification of such filing to the following:

Counsel for Defendants:

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

Ann E. Trivett, Esq., WSBA #39228 Salim D. Lewis, Esq., WSBA #52660 Thomas P. Miller, Esq., WSBA #34473

CHRISTIE LAW GROUP, PLLC

2100 Westlake Ave N, Ste 206

Seattle, WA 98109 P: 206-957-9669 F: 206-352-7875

Email: ann@christielawgroup.com;

salim@christielawgroup.com; tom@christielawgroup.com

□ Messenger

□ US Mail

□ Facsimile

□ Email

■ CM/ECF

I certify under penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of California that the foregoing is true and correct.

DATED at San Francisco, California this 14th day of September, 2021.

/s/ Maryleen Razo

MARYLEEN RAZO

Dolan Law Firm, PC 1438 Market Street San Francisco, CA 95102 Telephone: 415-421-2800

Fax: 415-421-2830

E-mail: Maryleen.Razo@dolanlawfirm.com

23

22

__

24

25

26

PLAINTIFFS' MOTION TO AMEND PURSUANT TO RULE 15(b)(1) - 5 CASE NO. 3:20-cv-05223-RJB